

Sri:

Sriman Narayana Charanau Sharanam

Reflections on Cause Effect Relationship

1. :Real, falsely-real, unreal:

2. Real is that which remains unchanged through all periods of time.

3. Mithya / falsely-real is that which appears to be real but is perceived to be changing or has changed.

4. Unreal is that which is said to not exist and is never perceived through all periods of time.

5. In the clay example, it is not the lump of clay, but clay itself that is considered as real.

6. A lump of clay has the same level of reality as a pot - mithya / falsely-real - which is just a name-form.

7. These name-form are all effects manifested from their previous material causes.

8. Shards are the effects, pot is the cause. Pot is the effect, lump of clay is the cause. Lump of clay is the effect, earth is the cause.

9. All of these are nothing but the reality - clay.

10. Clay is the substratum through which the cause-effect relationship manifests.

11. :Nature (svarupa) and Attribute (viseshana):

12. A brief review of the qualities said to be the nature (svarupa) versus attributes (viseshana) of an entity

13. The nature of an entity is defined as the qualities that are inseparable and indistinct from the entity. That without which an entity no longer exists as such.

14. For example: the sweetness of sugar, heat and light of a fire, etc.

15. The attribute of an entity is defined as the qualities that are inseparable but distinct from the entity. It only refers to a particular instance of an entity.

16. For example: granulated / powdered / large crystalized sugar, fire in a small lamp versus fire in a large log versus a forest fire, etc.

17. The nature of an entity is said to differentiate it from other entities of a different class - vijatiya bheda.
18. This is because all entities within the same class are defined to have the same nature as pertaining to the class. Hence the nature cannot be used to differentiate entities within the same class.
19. For example, the nature of the fire as heat & light cannot be used to differentiate between the fire in a small lamp versus fire in a large log versus a forest fire. Nature-wise, they are all the same fire. However, fire is different from sugar since their natures are different.
20. The attribute may or may not be different between entities in different classes. But the differentiation is primarily through the nature of the entities.
21. The attribute of an entity is said to mainly differentiate it from all other entities, particularly within the same class - sajatiya bheda.
22. This is because all entities within the same class are defined to have the same nature as pertaining to the class. The only differentiation has to be through distinct attributes.
23. For example, the name, form, instance of the fire in a lamp versus a large log versus a forest is used to differentiate between them.
24. Furthermore, only finite limited entities can have attributes distinct from itself. An infinite all-pervading entity cannot have any distinct attributes. All qualities, if existing, in an infinite all-pervading entity are only the nature of the entity.
25. This is because an infinite all-pervading entity cannot have any quality distinct from itself, as that distinction will limit the pervasiveness of that entity.
26. Also, there cannot be multiple infinite all-pervading entities within the same class that requires distinct attributes to distinguish between themselves.
27. Attributes are perceived only for finite limited entities. In fact, any finite limited entity can only be perceived with its attributes. It cannot be perceived without its attributes.
28. For example, a pot is capable of being perceived through sense organs. But just clay itself - independent of any specific form such as a lump or pot or shards - is incapable of sense perception. At the very least, a lump of clay or a particle of clay alone are capable of sense perception. Similarly, gold in a particular shape & form alone is capable of sense perception, not

pure gold itself bereft of any shape or form. In the same way, pure water alone is incapable of sense perception. Only water with specific attributes such as a drop or a lake or a river or an ocean can be perceived through senses.

29. Sense organs are only capable of perceiving finite limited entries with attributes. The sense organs are incapable of perceiving an infinite all-pervading entity bereft of attributes.

30. However, when the infinite all-pervading entity appears to be delimited by other finite limited entities, then the infinite all-pervading entity is capable of being perceived as conditioned by the finite limited entities.

31. For example, space is an infinite all-pervading entity. Space, as-is, does not contain any attributes. It has the quality of sound as its very nature. The true nature of the space, bereft of all conditionings, is incapable of being perceived by the sense organs. However, when the space is conditioned by the circumference of Earth, or limited by the Solar System, or limited by a house / room / pot, then the aspect of space as conditioned by the limiting factor is capable of being perceived.

32. :Transformation (parinama) and Transfiguration (vivarta) cause:

33. Material cause is said to be of 2 types - transformation (parinama) cause and transfiguration (vivarta) cause.

34. Transformation cause actually undergoes a change of its nature - such as milk into curd - or attributes - such as lump of clay into pots - to manifest the effect.

35. Transfiguration cause only appears as if it undergoes a change of its nature or attributes - such as rope into snake. There is no actual change on the true nature or attributes of the cause.

36. Some acharyas consider the transformation of just the attributes of an entity, while the nature remains the same, as an example of the transfiguration cause as well.

37. For instance, clay being seen as a lump and later as a pot. Herein, the attributes (name / form / function) are changing to a lump or a pot, but the nature of the cause - pure clay - remains unchanged.

38. Thus from the perspective of pure clay, there is no change to the nature of clay itself, but only the attributes of name / form / function changes from a lump into a pot etc.

39. But from the perspective of the lump of clay, there is a change of both the nature of the lump (of no definite form) and its attributes (shape & size) as it changes into a pot etc.

40. However, this should not be a serious contention as being considered as either transformation or transfiguration cause.

41. All effects and the transformation cause are only falsely-real. The transfiguration cause alone has the potential to be called as real.

42. If the transformation cause is considered as real, then the transformation of the cause into the effect implies a transformation / change of the real itself; which contradicts the definition of the real. Thus, transformation cause is only falsely-real.

43. :Cause-effect relationship:

44. Any entity directly perceived by senses is just the effect. All that is perceived by the senses are the effect alone

45. While the effect is being perceived, its cause is never directly perceived at the same time.

46. It is called an effect because it has been manifested.

47. That from which it is manifested is called the cause.

48. Since an effect is a distinct manifestation from the cause, this implies a change and thus effects are all falsely-real.

49. The relationship of an effect with its transformation cause is only an invariable concomitance inference brought about by perception, time, space and memory.

50. Perception is required for perceiving the transformation of the cause into the effect and build the inferential relationship between them for future

51. Since cause and effect are only sequential and not simultaneous, time is required to perceive the transformation.

52. Cause and effect exists during their respective manifestations. There is a spatial correlation between the two.

53. Connected through time & space is the memory of the earlier perception of the cause that provides continuity with the later perception of the effect. Bereft of memory, the cause-effect relationship cannot be established.

54. The relationship of an effect with its transfiguration cause is only brought about on the realization of the true nature of the cause, and in retrospect, the effect is said to be manifested from the cause.
55. For example, a snake is said to be the effect and the rope its cause only when the perception of the snake is sublated by the perception of rope in its place.
56. Until the sublation, the rope as the cause remains veiled.
57. Because the true nature of the rope is veiled, the mind superimposes the imagery of a snake in its place and perceives it.
58. As long as the true nature of the rope is not realized, the perception of a snake is taken for granted to be the true nature of that entity.
59. The transfiguration cause-effect relationship between the rope and the snake remains hidden.
60. Until the direct realization that the entity is a rope, even though hearing from others who have recognized the true nature of the entity as the rope, their words remain a mere intellectual opinion and is subject to inaccurate contentions and arguments.
61. With the direct realization of the entity as the rope, the rope is then understood to be the 'causeless cause' of the snake.
62. The 'cause', because the perception of the snake originates from the entity - rope. That which is the rope appears as the snake.
63. 'Causeless' because from the perspective of the rope, it has always been a rope and never changed into anything else.
64. In the same way, the one alone and non-dual Brahman is understood to be the 'causeless cause' of the perceived world of duality.

Iti Sriman Narayanasmrith

Vedanta.Mananam@gmail.com